UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/771,761	01/29/2001	Jeff A. Zimniewicz	MS160268.1	8645

27195 7590 04/03/2006		EXAMINER
AMIN & TUROCY, LLP		YIGDALL, MICHAEL J
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER		

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2192	

1900 EAST NINTH STREET
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

DATE MAILED: 04/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

|	EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER
	20060329

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The Reply Brief filed on June 27, 2005 is acknowledged.

It is noted that Appellant now proposes an example to illustrate the intended use of the "valid order" in the present invention (page 4, last paragraph). First, this argument was already addressed in the Examiner's Answer at pages 6-7, and second, the examiner cannot find where such an example is disclosed in the specification as originally filed. It is also noted that Appellant cites additional references to the specification to lend support for the "means for" language of claim 25 (page 4, top). Still, cited paragraph [0029], for example, defines a "valid order" no further than an order in which all shared components are installed after all non-shared components. Curtis likewise teaches a valid order in which the depending program is installed after all dependent components, as indicated at page 5 of the Examiner's Answer.

TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

MY

Michael J. Yigdall
Examiner
Art Unit 2192